



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMN

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | | | ATT | ORNEY DOOR |
|-----------------|--|-----------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| 08/902,809 : | | SCHUEGRAF MM21/0419 SSNER & KLUTH | | К | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | |
| 0 00V 7338 | | | . 1 | EXAMINER NADAV, O | | |
| IINNEAPOLIS 1 | | | | ART UNI | T | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | | 2811 | | 1/- |
| • | | | | DATE MAILED: 04/19/99 | | /) (19/99 |
| | | | | | | 47 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



Advisory Action

Application No. 08/902,809

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

Schuegraf et al

ORI NADAV 2811



| THE | ERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)] | |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| ä | expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. | |
| i | expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection. | |
| 0 | rextension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The eon which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of ermining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be culated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above. | |
| | pellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on (or within any iod for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a). | |
| App but | ant's response to the final rejection, filed on <u>Jan 11, 1999</u> has been considered with the following effect, NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance: | |
| X | e proposed amendment(s): | |
| (| will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief. | |
| [| will not be entered because: | |
| | IX they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below). | |
| | they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below). | |
| | they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. | |
| | they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | |
| | NOTE: Amended calims 23, 26, 30, 39 and 42 warrant further consideration and/or search | _ |
| | Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): | - |
| | ewly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a eparate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. | - |
| | ne affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition or allowance because: | - |
| | ne affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | - |
| X | or purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): | |
| | laims allowed: None | _ |
| | laims objected to: None | - |
| | laims rejected: 23-43 | - |
| | he proposed drawing correction filed on hashas not been approved by the Examiner. | |
| | ote the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). | |
| | ther /om /nowns | |
| _ | Tom Thomas | |
| | Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 2800 | |